

Approved June 29, 2005



**MINUTES  
SCOTTSDALE PLANNING COMMISSION  
KIVA - CITY HALL  
3939 N. DRINKWATER BOULEVARD  
JUNE 15, 2005**

**PRESENT:** David Gulino, Chairman  
Steve Steinberg, Vice Chairman  
David Barnett, Commissioner  
James Heitel, Commissioner  
Eric Hess, Commissioner  
Jeffrey Schwartz, Commissioner  
Steven Steinke, Commissioner

**STAFF:** Donna Bronski  
Ed Gawf  
Richard Goecke  
Kurt Jones  
Phil Kercher

**CALL TO ORDER**

The regular meeting of the Scottsdale Planning Commission was called to order by Chairman Gulino at 5:04 p.m.

**ROLL CALL**

A formal roll call confirmed members present as stated above.

**MINUTES APPROVAL**

June 8, 2005 Study Session Minutes

**COMMISSIONER BARNETT MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE JUNE 8 STUDY SESSION MINUTES AS WRITTEN. SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER STEINKE. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY A VOTE OF SEVEN (7) TO ZERO (0).**

**APPROVED**

June 8, 2005 Regular Meeting Minutes

Commissioner Barnett requested that the Commission obtain verbatim minutes of the June 8, 2005 meeting. Approval of minutes will be deferred until review of the requested verbatim minutes.

**CONTINUANCE**

23-ZN-2004 (Scottsdale & Lone Mountain)

**COMMISSIONER BARNETT MOVED TO CONTINUE CASE 23-ZN-2004 TO THE JULY 13TH 2005 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING. SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER SCHWARTZ. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY A VOTE OF SEVEN (7) TO ZERO (0).**

**EXPEDITED AGENDA**

32-UP-2004 (Shurgard Storage)

**COMMISSIONER SCHWARTZ MOVED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF CASE 32-UP-2004 BECAUSE IT MEETS THE SPECIAL USE PERMIT REQUIREMENTS AND THE AMENDED STIPULATIONS. SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER BARNETT. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY A VOTE OF SEVEN (7) TO ZERO (0).**

**REGULAR AGENDA**

**12-UP-2003#2 (BASIC CHARTER SCHOOL)**

Kurt Jones introduced the case. The request is to increase enrollment from the 200 students maximum to 250 students. The site consists of an existing two-story building and 34 parking spaces. The increase in students would not increase the size of the building. Access to the site consists of two driveways off of San Salvador. The key issue is circulation. The use permit was approved in 2003; however, as a result of the recently completed improvements there is very little history with regard to the implementation of this queuing and circulation pattern. Staff is recommending denial based on the character of traffic issues with the existing site despite recent completion of circulation improvements.

Mr. Jones reported that the issue is not traffic flow but the backup of traffic on to San Salvador. Mr. Jones presented slides depicting the traffic situation. The use permit requires five vehicles on site to queue. This site meets that requirement. The issue that staff has is with the afternoon pick-up time versus dropping-off, which is a smoother process. Staff is requesting denial at this time and recommending that the Applicant consider options for addressing the current situation. Mr. Jones noted that the unsolved present issues could result in revocation of the use permit. Staff requests that the application return after the current issues are rectified.

Mr. Jones indicated that staff has devised a list of stipulations in the event that the Planning Commission wishes to consider approval of the case.

**APPROVED**

Vice Chairman Steinberg questioned whether accidents have occurred as a result of the queuing situation. Phil Kercher responded that a search for accidents was not performed and he has no knowledge that accidents have occurred.

Upon inquiry by Commissioner Hess, Mr. Jones provided the Commission with a list of revised stipulations. Phil Kercher addressed the Commission, noting that the additional stipulation would be the requirement for staggering; ensuring that all students are not arriving and leaving at the same time. Commissioner Hess questioned if staggering would adequately solve the problems. Mr. Kercher indicated that staggering would help. Mr. Jones added that the application was untimely for the purpose of allowing staff to research alternate options or methods and appropriately evaluate the circulation issues.

Upon inquiry by Commissioner Schwartz, Mr. Kercher informed the Commission that the public schools are not controlled; however, the Transportation Department does encourage them to have as much pick-up/drop-off space as possible.

In response to inquiry by Commissioner Barnett, Mr. Jones reported that the exits off of San Salvador onto Via Linda are non-signalized intersections. Some of the traffic exiting the industrial park uses the signalized San Salvador entrance to board the freeway. Commissioner Barnett also inquired as to the status of traffic complaints received by the police department. Mr. Jones reported that the police department was having issues with parking; however, those issues resolved upon completion of improvements to the site, as required by the original conditional use permit.

Commissioner Barnett queried the difference between an 800-foot queue of stopped parked cars and an 800 foot queue at a major intersection that is bound traffic. Mr. Kercher explained that there is greater capacity at an intersection and the vehicles are clearing out much quicker; probably in a 30 second time period. He noted, as viewed in the slide presentation, that traffic at this location dissipates at a much slower rate.

Commissioner Barnett pointed out that the Applicant's traffic engineer indicated that if the school were to stagger the finish time by 30-minutes, even with the additional 50 students, this would provide for improved egress out of the site, with shorter wait times. He commented that it appears that the Applicant is already addressing part of the problem and questioned, in light of that fact, why this is a persisting issue. Mr. Jones reported that staff has not seen this solution work with the existing number of students; therefore, it is difficult for staff to recommend approval for additional students. Upon inquiry by Commissioner Hess, a brief discussion identified schools that employ the staggering method.

Upon inquiry by Commissioner Barnett regarding the option of granting the Applicant a one-year use permit, Mr. Jones affirmed that it could be monitored for a year.

Chairman Gulino noted receipt of 12 cards, all in favor of the case; ten of which would like to speak. He addressed the public, identifying that the purpose of the hearing is to discuss whether the increased enrollment from 200 to 250 would create a problem in this location. Chairman Gulino requested that comments from the public be limited to addressing the specific issue.

Cort Rich, 7272 East Indian School Road, Suite 360, Scottsdale, addressed the Commission on behalf of the Applicant, Basis Scottsdale Charter School. Mr. Rich's PowerPoint presentation included an overview of the school's accomplishments and a brief history surrounding the

conditional use permit. The school is run by Olga and Michael Block who have extensive experience in teaching and run a similar school in Tucson. Basis Charter is a free public school.

Mr. Cort reiterated the request for 50 additional students. Basis Charter is a middle school; 6th, 7th and 8th grades. Upon approval of the request, Basis Charter will expand to include 9th grade. Additional highlights of Mr. Rich's presentation included an emphasis on support received from the community, the Scottsdale Police Department, and business owners in the area.

Mr. Cort reiterated the traffic engineer's findings, concluding that the modification of school departure time would alleviate any traffic circulation difficulties at the end of the day.

Mr. Cort stated that the Applicant will self-impose the following stipulations, upon approval: Stagger end times of the school day; utilize monitors to prevent students from leaving school grounds on foot; and at the end of the 2005/2006 school year, the City traffic department can review the traffic situation at Basis and provide comments to the Applicant. If at the conclusion of any review, the City reasonably determines that a traffic situation places the Applicant in violation of its use permit or City Code, and the Applicant can not cure that in any way, staff will place an item on the agenda to allow the PMZ and Council to consider requiring the Applicant to go back to a maximum enrollment of 200 students for the following school year. The review described in this section must be completed within 30-days of the last day of the regular classes at Basis for the 2005/2006 school year to allow any impacted students the opportunity to find other schools for the following year, in necessary.

Upon inquiry by Commissioner Heitel regarding the proposed staggered end times, Mr. Cort clarified that there will be two end times, one-half hour apart. Commissioner Heitel queried the possibility of implementing a double lane queuing in the 24-foot space allocation. Mr. Cort expressed belief that the problem will be resolved with the combination of the new configuration and the staggered end time.

In response to a question by Vice Chairman Steinberg regarding accommodations for 50 additional students, Mr. Rich indicated that an office space on the second floor will be transformed into class space. Vice Chairman Steinberg noted that the space per student is much more than the norm in traditional school planning.

Commissioner Steinke commented that by virtue of the revocation process, the third stipulation suggested by the Applicant is not a stipulation that fits the criteria for the process.

John Morton, Scottsdale resident, addressed the Commission. He opined that traffic would improve with the staggered end times.

David Pierce, addressed the Commission, opining that the staggered end time should have a positive impact on the traffic situation and expressed support for the school.

Brooke Hamlet, a teacher at Basis, addressed the Commission regarding the queuing issue and the ability to accommodate additional students.

Sherry Pierce, a teacher at Basis, addressed the Commission regarding resolved parking issues and the impact of after school programs in relation to traffic problems.

Thomas Davison, math teacher at Basis, addressed the Commission. He suggested training parents to assist in resolving the queuing issue.

**APPROVED**

Pamela Curtis, parent, addressed the Commission regarding early release days and queuing issues related to industrial park parking.

Patrick Kolb, science teacher at Basis, addressed the Commission regarding the positive impacts of extra curricular activities in relation to traffic issues and expressed favor to increasing the enrollment.

Diane Moser, Scottsdale resident and Director of Basis Scottsdale Charter School, addressed the Commission. She opined that the staggered release times will alleviate the traffic concerns identified by staff. Safety and security of the students is a number one concern.

Michael and Olga Block, co-founders of Basis, addressed the Commission. Mrs. Block addressed the student capacity question. Mr. Block explained the financial need to increase enrollment in order to continue the school in Scottsdale. He also addressed the queuing issue. Mrs. Block reiterated that the changes were completed in the parking lot during the middle of the school year and the benefits of the staggered release times.

Vice Chairman Steinberg questioned whether the Applicant would be returning to request increased enrollment in the future and opined that the school is operating at its maximum based on the curve and the queuing situation. Mr. Block affirmed that there is no additional capacity at the school.

Commissioner Schwartz agreed that the urban settings are the appropriate locations for these types of schools and commented that if there were a problem, the police department would be addressing it. He noted receiving no serious concerns from the police department. He further stated that staff can assess and monitor the results of the proposed staggering and recommended approval of this application.

Upon inquiry and suggestion by Commissioner Heitel, Mr. Kercher agreed that the "no parking" zone in the area could be extended in order to increase the right-of-way opening.

Mr. Jones addressed Chairman Gulino's request for clarification regarding the proposed stipulations. Speaking to the three stipulations noted in Applicant's presentation, staff suggested adding stip number 12 under circulation: The Applicant shall provide a school schedule with staggered start and dismissal times for staff review and approval prior to the 2005/2006 school year.

Chairman Gulino reiterated belief that the staggered dismissal times would solve the problems and expressed support for the case, with the proposed stipulations. He expressed opposition to dictating student foot traffic. Further discussion between the Commission and staff reiterated that staff will monitor the queuing/traffic issue.

**COMMISSIONER SCHWARTZ MOVED TO APPROVE CASE 12-UP-2003#2 WITH THE ATTACHED STIPULATIONS AND THE ADDITIONAL STIPULATION THAT THE APPLICANT SHALL PROVIDE A SCHEDULE WITH STAGGERED START AND DISMISSAL TIMES FOR STAFF REVIEW AND APPROVAL WHICH SHALL NOT BE UNREASONABLY WITHHELD PRIOR TO THE 2005/2006 SCHOOL YEAR, AND THE ADDITIONAL STIPULATION THAT THE ON-STREET PARKING BETWEEN THIS SITE THE SCOTTSDALE SCHOOL MAINTENANCE YARD BE POSTED NO PARKING. SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER HEITEL.**

**APPROVED**

Ms. Bronski noted that the stipulation regarding the on-street parking is a direction to the City and is not a stipulation to the Applicant. Mr. Schwartz acknowledged that it is the City's responsibility to post the signs, not the Applicant's.

**THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY A VOTE OF SEVEN (7) TO ZERO (0).**

**26-ZN-2004 (ASU-SCOTTSDALE CENTER FOR NEW TECHNOLOGY AND INNOVATION)**

Ed Gawf, Assistant City Manager, introduced the case, which calls for rezoning 42-acres of property located at McDowell and Scottsdale Road. A work session to discuss revitalization efforts in the southern part of the City is scheduled with the Planning Commission on July 13th.

The zoning request before the Commission is to rezone 42-acres from existing zoning of C-3 and C-S to PCD, which is Planned Community District with amended standards which allows for the implementation of the ASU-Scottsdale vision. The Planning Commission is being asked to review that rezoning request and forward a recommendation to the City Council.

Highlights of Mr. Gawf's presentation included a brief history of the property. Since purchasing the property in August of 2004, the City of Scottsdale has entered into a long-term lease with The ASU Foundation.

Mr. Gawf presented a map denoting the specific rezoning, noting that 37 of 42 acres are leased by the ASU Foundation and 5-acres have been retained by the City, consisting of two parcels.

The rezoning includes four major areas. One of the areas is the development framework plans, which have specific plans showing the development of the buildings, the parking, open space areas, and public gathering areas. It also includes the open space plan, the landscaping, circulation, street sections and guiding principals.

The second major area is permitted land uses. Mr. Gawf explained that in a Planned Community District the uses and the development standards are drawn from other existing zoning districts. In this case, land uses are being drawn from three existing zoning districts: POC (planned regional center), commercial office and industrial park. These three districts form the basis for the uses that are being allowed in this particular PCD. The specific uses include research and development uses, office support retail services, residential and the flexibility necessary to implement this vision of the ASU-Scottsdale Center.

The third major area is development standards. The PRC is the basis being used for the development standards as these most closely reflect the uses and the vision of the ASU-Scottsdale Center. Height is 60 feet; stated in the lease between the Foundation and the City. The floor area ratio is .8, which is consistent with the PRC zoning and the lease. Open space includes 30-foot pedestrian landscaped areas along the major roads as well as the east/west pedestrian spine. Building step-backs are addressed as part of the stipulations. Parking is 1 space per 300 square feet, which is the standard parking for office development.

Mr. Gawf noted that there are four requested amendments and explained that PRC, which is primarily intended to be a regional commercial center, has limitations on the amount of residential and office use that can occur. The .8 FAR has been retained, but the other limitations

**APPROVED**

of non-office use have been eliminated. Office use in this development will be more than is normally allowed in PRC.

There are two methods for calculating open space in PRC: a provision is being done that talks about a variety of different calculations that are done in determining the amount of open space, but it concludes with the statement that it shall be no less than 20%. A minimum of 20% of open space which is consistent with the PRC zoning.

The third area is the parking calculations. The only difference is for the retail, the total square footage is 1.2 million square feet. Of that, 135,000 square will be retail. The rest will be office development. The retail parking is 1 to 250. For simplicities sake, the ratio has been combined to 1 to 300. The City has also required a transportation demand management program as part of the office development. Parking structures are eliminated from the floor area and volume ratio; the intent of which is to incentivize structured parking versus surface parking. No surface parking off the street is allowed with this project.

The final amended development standard is building setback. The requirement is that buildings in the PRC zone must step-back above 36 feet, two feet for every foot of height. Deviation from this standard is based on the importance of granting design flexibility for the individual buildings, each of which will be subject to DRB review and approval.

Mr. Gawf reported that some of the major conditions for approval (stipulations), include a minimum of one and one-quarter acre of public gathering space; landscaping along Scottsdale Road, McDowell and 74th Avenue will be improved; buildings shall be placed predominantly at the set-back line; parking structures shall be screened from all of the major roads and from the internal roads; all non-residential development shall conform to the certified standards.

Mr. Gawf recalled the Ad-Hoc Advisory Group appointed by City Council, offered a brief history of the group and noted some of the achievements of the public-outreach project. He advised the Commission that many of the conditions of approval were a culmination of staff's efforts to translate the thoughts and concepts of the Ad-Hoc Advisory Working Group document into stipulations. Additionally, the Working Group identified the guiding principals that should govern the development of this site.

Mr. Gawf recalled the steps taken to arrive at this point and stated that the zoning entitlement is a culmination of efforts within the first step. He reported that the Development Review Board has given a unanimous recommendation on the amended development standards. The second step involves looking at the specific building design and site plan designs. The first phase site plan elevations are expected to be received in July and August, be presented to the DRB the later part of August, and on to City Council on September 20th for approval with the goal of commencing construction in the first part of 2006. Planning Commission members will be involved in each step of the project.

In closing, Mr. Gawf stated that staff recommends approval and reiterated that rezoning to PCD is the right District.

Upon inquiry by Chairman Gulino, Mr. Gawf confirmed that the City and The Foundation are co-applicants of this project. The City of Scottsdale purchased the land and as a provision of the lease will provide basic infrastructure, up to 44.5 million dollars, which will consist of water, sewer, perimeter landscaping, public gathering spaces and structured parking. Mr. Gawf believes

**APPROVED**

the on-site infrastructure construction would be best done by the developer in conjunction with the development of the buildings. A brief discussion regarding development timelines ensued.

John Berry, Law of Office of Berry and Demure, 6750 East Camelback, Scottsdale, addressed the Commission on behalf of the ASU Foundation. He shared brief introductory comments, reiterating points presented by Mr. Gawf regarding PCD zoning.

Steve Evans, ASU Foundation Trustee, 6991 East Camelback Road, presented an overview of the project from the Foundation's perspective. Highlights of his presentation included a brief history of technology development at ASU, concepts of the development, the expectation of ASU and the City, benefits to the City, and selection of the development team. Mr. Evans spoke about his involvement with the Citizen's Advisory Committee and the guidelines established by the Committee. Mr. Evans reiterated several points addressed previously by Mr. Gawf and reported that this project will be designed to LEED standard certification; the only commercial property in the City of Scottsdale to do so.

Mr. Evans continued with a PowerPoint presentation highlighting The Foundation's mission, the Center's multi-use objectives, the advantages of ASU connectivity, and identification of the lead partners in the project.

Sharon Harper, Higgins Plaza Company, 9401 West Thunderbird Road, Peoria, Arizona addressed the Commission. She articulated the Plaza Companies background and business relationships. Her presentation highlighted the Center's success strategies, business and research opportunities at the Center, the Center's competitive advantages, the importance of ASU's presence at the Center and the vision of the project design.

Georgia Sarkin of Pei Cobb & Freed Partners, addressed the plans for the site, specifically highlighting the vision and guiding principals for the project, the architects approach to the site as well as the development framework plans for the site. Ms. Sarkin briefly explained land uses, access points and circulation, the north/south interior street, the pedestrian network, perimeter landscaping, signalized intersections, and open space uses. She concluded her presentation with illustrative site plans denoting several options for development of the project.

Rita Saunders, speaking on behalf of the Chairman of the Scottsdale Coalition, addressed the Commission, stating that the Coalition fully expects the City and the developers to follow the guidelines as laid out by the Ad-Hoc Committee's work; specifically as they relate to the characterization studies, building materials, step-backs and set-backs, and maximum heights. The Coalition would strongly support an on-site hotel.

Lyle Wurtz addressed the Commission and expressed strong opposition to the rezoning.

Ray Pilloud, Scottsdale resident, addressed the Commission. He commended Scottsdale for having vision and revitalizing the area and expressed favor for the project.

Mike Merrill, representing Citizens for Responsible Redevelopment addressed the Commission. Mr. Merrill expressed that the major concern from the residents in the area is a fear of this project becoming a campus style dormitory setting. He requested that a stipulation be added into the zoning that would require any residential component return to the Commission for acceptance.



Commissioner Schwartz queried the point of view regarding the negative response to residential in the area. Mr. Merrill expressed that the opposition is not necessarily to general residential but specifically directed to dormitory housing. A brief discussion ensued, whereupon Commissioner Schwartz expressed understanding for the dormitory issue, but stated that he believes residential is going to be a strong component and needs to be a strong component of the revitalization of the entire area.

Don Couvillion addressed the Commission on behalf of Drew Brown and read a letter from Mr. Brown into the record. Mr. Brown expressed favor for the project and strongly recommended that the Planning Commission and City Council approve the zoning.

John Berry expressed appreciation for the articulated support. In addressing Mr. Merrill's comments, Mr. Berry advised that ASU has no desire to place dormitories, fraternities or sororities to house students at this location. Mr. Berry reiterated points presented by Mr. Evans and directed attention to the six guiding principles which call for a balanced land use mix. Mr. Evans defined that the requirement is to create a mixed used environment and the desired high activity level in the area. Example: office, research, retail, hotel, cultural, civic, open space, multi-use parking and a variety of housing including mid-density lots or town homes.

Mr. Gawf responded to comments, noting that the on-site hotel is a great idea. He addressed stipulations relative to the height issues and in closing, addressed the dormitory issued, pointing out that the lease provision requires that the ASU Foundation build 1.2 million square feet of non-residential. Mr. Gawf explained the reasoning behind the residential component in the zoning and advised that residential components, under any circumstance, would have to be approved by City Council. Staff recommends approval of the rezoning request.

Commissioner Heitel questioned whether consideration had been given to the process of designing the project phases, in relation to open space lying vacant for many years. Mr. Gawf responded that a variety of techniques are being considered for the used portion; however, the bottom line is the property has to be maintained in a positive way that benefits the neighborhood. The perimeter landscaping will be part of the first phase.

Mr. Evans noted that a significant part of the project will contain surface parking which will be landscaped to City standards.

Commissioner Steinberg queried the amount of remaining financial proceeds allocated for infrastructure, which includes parking. Mr. Gawf confirmed. Commissioner Steinberg stressed citizen comfort in the fact that the proceeds will cover rising costs in construction that may occur prior to the building of parking structures. Mr. Gawf reported that the City's contribution is limited to 44.5 million.

Commissioner Steinke commended the collaborated effort of the presentations.

Upon query by Commissioner Steinke, discussion ensued to specifically clarify the requested amended standards for the purpose of defining an appropriate motion.

Mr. Gawf requested inclusion of the four amended standards and the following findings which deal with: consistency with the general plan; the impacts on the infrastructure being capably handled; the vision of a knowledge based research development center; the fact that the uses are consistent and supportive of the surrounding area; that it will use environmental considerations in the development of the site; and that the amended standards will help achieve this vision and finally, it will serve as a catalyst for the revitalization of this area.

**APPROVED**

Mr. Berry noted that there is a requirement in the PCD ordinance that the Planning Commission make a finding similar to use permits and requested that the motion include that the presentation of written materials and staff report, that the findings of the zoning ordinance, Section 5.2105, sections A, B, and C, have been met.

Commissioner Schwartz expressed confidence that the development of the project will exceed all expectations and create delight in what this project will bring to the community.

Commissioner Heitel added that he is very comfortable supporting this project and congratulated the efforts by everyone involved in the project. He suggested that Steve Steinberg represent the Planning Commission in the issues that go before design review. Commissioner Steinberg accepted the recommendation.

Upon request by Chairman Gulino, Mr. Evans explained that the first phase will include 260,000 square feet. He noted that it will likely occur on the west end of the boulevard on both sides of the boulevard, nearing the Scottsdale Road frontage. Additional uses are being contemplated that could make it larger than the 250,000 feet and those uses could go in several different locations, but the likely scenario will include retail along the boulevard with the office/research above that. Streetscape, including sidewalks, bike paths and landscaping is also included in the first phase. Chairman Gulino queried the process of evolution of the project in terms of various approvals. Mr. Gawf clarified that the first phase will go to DRB for review and recommendation and then Council, acting as the DRB, will approve the details of the first phase, which will set the pattern for the entire development. Mr. Berry clarified that Council will only review the project automatically in Phase One. Future phases will go to Development Review Board. The zoning ordinance allows the City Council to take an appeal of a Development Review Board decision, if they wish.

**COMMISSIONER SCHWARTZ MOVED TO APPROVE CASE 26-ZN-2005. THE PLANNING COMMISSION FORWARDS A MOTION RECOMMENDING APPROVAL OF THE ZONING TO THE PC DISTRICT WITH AMENDED DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS AND THE PLANNING COMMISSION FINDS THAT THE REZONING IS IN CONFORMANCE TO THE PCD DISTRICT FINDINGS REQUIRED AS NOTED HERE ON ITEMS A, B AND C.**

Upon suggestion by Mr. Gawf, Commissioner Schwartz agreed to strike the following from the motion, but requested that it remain part of the record:

ANY TIME THE DESIGN REVIEW BOARD IS TO HEAR ANY ELEMENTS OF THE SITE PLAN OR ARCHITECTURE THAT COMMISSIONER STEINBERG, AS LONG AS HE IS AN ACTIVE MEMBER OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION, SIT ON THE DESIGN REVIEW BOARD. IN HIS ABSENCE, A PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBER WILL BE APPOINTED TO ATTEND AND REVIEW ELEMENTS OF THE SITE PLAN.

**SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER STEINKE. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY A VOTE OF SEVEN (7) TO ZERO (0).**

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

With no further business to discuss, the regular meeting of the Scottsdale Planning Commission was adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
A-V Tronics, Inc.

**APPROVED**